



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/069,728 04/29/98 MURPHY

S MICL.042

EXAMINER

WM02/0102

JEFFREY A PYLE  
ARNOLD WHITE AND DURKEE  
P O BOX 77210  
HOUSTON TX 77210

ALPHONSE, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED:

01/02/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/069,728

Applicant(s)  
Murphy

Examiner  
Fritz Alphonse

Group Art Unit  
2675



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 24, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-35 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-35 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 8
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2775

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. This is in response to amendment filed on October 16, 2000 in which claims 1, 11, 12, 16, and 17 are amended, claim 10 is canceled, and claims 22-35 are added.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1, 11-12, 15-17, 20-27, and 34-35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Graybill (U.S. Pat. No. 5,669,571).

As to claims 1, 11-12, 16-17 and 22, Graybill (figs. 1-3) show a method for entering data into a computer, comprising: anchoring an electrical cord (230) connecting a peripheral input device (225) to the computer; positioning the peripheral input device; and between the peripheral input device and the computer, winding up the electrical cord to retract slack in the electrical cord as the peripheral input device is positioned (col. 4, lines 12-25; see abstract).

Art Unit: 2775

In addition, as to claims 26-27, Graybill discloses a method for entering data into a computer, comprising: anchoring an electrical cord (230), and maintaining a fixed length of the electrical cord between the peripheral input device and the computer (col.3, lines 26-51).

As to claim 15, Graybill (fig. 3) shows a method, wherein moving the peripheral input device includes moving a mouse and a pointer displayed by the computer.

As to claims 20 and 21, Graybill (figs. 1-3) show a method, wherein positioning the mouse includes positioning a pointer displayed by the computer and wherein retracting slack in the electrical cord includes retracting the slack into at least one of the mouse and an anchor.

As to claims 23-25, and 34-35, Graybill (fig. 3) shows a method, wherein the peripheral input device includes positioning a mouse (225), the peripheral input device includes positioning a pointer displayed by the computer (205) and, moving a mouse and a pointer displayed by the computer (205).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-9, 13-14, 18-19, 27-33, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graybill (U.S. Pat. No. 5,669,571) in view of Lundberg (U.S. Pat. No. 5,844,775).

Art Unit: 2775

As to claims 2-9, 13-14, 18-19, 28-33, Graybill does not explicitly teaches anchoring the electrical cord includes anchoring the electrical cord to a desktop or a mouse pad and, wherein anchoring the electrical cord includes at least one of adhering and fastening an anchor to the desktop and a computer chassis.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Lundberg (figs. 10, 11, 12, 16, and 19) show a method, wherein, anchoring the electrical cord includes anchoring the electrical cord to a desktop and a computer chassis (see fig. 16); wherein anchoring the electrical cord includes at least one of adhering and fastening an anchor to the desktop; wherein anchoring the electrical cord includes anchoring the electrical cord to a mouse pad (16); wherein anchoring the electrical cord includes at least one of adhering and fastening an anchor to the mouse pad (16); wherein anchoring the electrical cord to the work surface includes anchoring the electrical cord to a desktop or a mouse pad (col. 3, line 46 through col. 4, line 10); wherein anchoring the electrical cord to the work surface includes at least one of adhering and fastening an anchor to the work surface.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to improve upon the mouse cable holder as taught by Lundberg because that would eliminate the excess of slack in the electrical cord which is a nuisance and, the cord is liable to knock over or otherwise bother whatever is sitting on the support table for the mouse pad.

Art Unit: 2775

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 2775

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(703)308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA.,  
Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner  
should be directed to Fritz Alphonse whose telephone number is (703) 308-8534.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's  
supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached on (703) 305-9720.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding  
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

  
F. Alphonse

Art Unit: 2775

December 29, 2000

  
**STEVEN SARAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**